

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 9 was previously canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 5, and 7 are amended herein. Claims 10-16 are added herein. Claims 1-8 and 10-16 remain in the application. No new matter has been added. Consideration and examination is respectfully requested.

1. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-4 UNDER U.S.C. § 102(b):

In the next to last paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action having DATE MAILED of 19 October 2005 (Paper No./Mail Date 20051004) referred to hereinafter as the Office Action of 19 October 2005, claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Talley in U.S. Patent Number 5,301,156 entitled "CONFIGURABLE SELF-TEST FOR EMBEDDED RAMS" hereinafter *Talley*. Applicant respectfully traverses.

As stated in MPEP 2131 "To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." As will be shown in the following paragraphs, *Talley* fails to teach every element of claims 1-4.

1.1 Regarding Rejection of Independent Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Among other items, *Talley* does not disclose "when a defect is present in one of the slice arrays, the input/output circuit associated with the defective slice array redirects data intended for storage in the defective slice array to an adjacent slice array of the defective slice array, otherwise, the input/output circuit associated with the slice array directs data intended for storage in the slice array to the slice array" and "when a defect is present in one of the slice arrays, the input/output circuit associated with the defective slice array redirects data read from the adjacent slice array of the defective slice array to the output of the defective slice array, otherwise, the input/output circuit associated with the slice array directs data read from the slice array to the output of the slice array" which are elements of claim 1 of the Present Application.

Thus, Applicant has demonstrated that *Talley* fails to teach every element of claim 1. Because *Talley* fails to teach every element of claim 1 as required by MPEP 2131, *Talley* does not anticipate claim 1. In addition, *Talley* fails to suggest every element of claim 1. As such, claim 1 is allowable over *Talley*.

1.2 Regarding Rejection of Dependent Claims 2-4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Because dependent claims 2-4 depend from independent claim 1, it is noted that dependent claims 2-4 have all the features described above for claim 1 as elements. As demonstrated above, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by *Talley*, nor does *Talley* suggest every element of claim 1.

Thus, Applicant has demonstrated that *Talley* fails to teach every element of claims 2-4. Because *Talley* fails to teach every element of claims 2-4 as required by MPEP 2131, *Talley* does not anticipate claims 2-4. In addition, *Talley* fails to suggest every element of claims 2-4. As such, claims 2-4 are allowable over *Talley*.

2. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER (OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 5-8):

In the last paragraph on page 5 of the Office Action of 19 October 2005, claims 5-8 were objected to as "being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Applicant respectively traverses the objection.

However, to overcome the objection of the Office Action of 19 October 2005, claims 5 and 7 have been rewritten so as to include the limitations of their base claim (claim 1) as written prior to the present Amendment. There were no intervening claims. Claim 6 depends from now independent claim 5, and claim 8 depends from now independent claim 7. Thus, Applicant has overcome the objection of the Office Action of 19 October 2005, and claims 5-8 are allowable.

3. NEW CLAIMS 10-16:

For reasons that are readily apparent new claims 10-16 are also allowable.

4. IN CONCLUSION:

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that all claims pending in the Present Application as described above are allowable and that all other issues raised by the Examiner have been rectified. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider his rejections and to grant an early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

by Morley C. Tobey, Jr.

Morley C. Tobey, Jr.

Reg. No. 43,955

January 9, 2006

Loveland, CO 80537

(970) 669-1266